



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/554,286	10/25/2005	Friedrich Linhart	278601US0PCT	3259

22850 7590 06/04/2008
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

WALTERS JR, ROBERT S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

4172

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

06/04/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/554,286	Applicant(s) LINHART ET AL.	
	Examiner ROBERT S. WALTERS JR	Art Unit 4172	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ROBERT S. WALTERS JR. (3) David P. Stitzel.
 (2) Vickie Kim. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 27 May 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-7.

Identification of prior art discussed: Koichi et al. and Dyllick-Brenzinger et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: A potential amendment to the claim language was discussed in regard to the claim objections. The prior art of record in regards to the 103 rejections was discussed. A translation of Koichi et al. was requested. Unexpected result from sole treatment of vinylamine containing cationic polymer was emphasized by applicant and discussed. An amendment to the preamble of claim 1 was finally discussed. No agreement with respect to the claims was reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

R.W., Exam. GAU 4172
 /Vickie Kim/ SPE trainer

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. Examiner's signature, if required